(Table 2.0 Continued)

Task	Material Costs	Residential Energy Solutions Evaluation Budget Estimated Hours (Program Years 2 and 3 (through February 2012))															
		Vice President	Principal	Principal	Senior Associate	Principal	Senior Associate	Senior Analyst	Associate	Consultant Associate	Consultant Analyst	Managing Consultant	Principal Consultant	Consultant Analyst	Principal Consultant	Total	Using Avg of PY2 / PY3 rates
[redacted]		[redacted]															
PY 2 and PY 3 rate average		[redacted]															
1. Evaluation Plan		[redacted]															
2. Verification and QA/QC Plan																-	$ -
3. Review Tracking																-	$ -
4. Implement Plan																-	$ -
a. Home Energy Perf	[redacted]	[redacted]															
b. Res HVAC T-U	[redacted]	[redacted]															
c. Res App recycle	[redacted]	[redacted]															
d. Res Light & App	[redacted]	[redacted]															
e. Res Multifamily	[redacted]	[redacted]															
f. Res New HVAC	[redacted]	[redacted]															
g. Res DR-DLC	[redacted]	[redacted]															
5. Reporting / Management	[redacted]	[redacted]															
6. Evaluation Support		[redacted]															
Total	[redacted]	[redacted]															

	Estimated Hours (June 2008 – February 2012)										
	Vice President	Principals	Senior Associate	Senior Analyst	Associate	Consultant Associate	Consultant Analyst	Managing Consultant	Principal Consultant	Consultant Analyst	TOTAL
Estimated Labor Hours	[redacted]										
Total Labor Cost											[redacted]
Total Material Cost											[redacted]
Total Evaluation Cost											[redacted]

9.5 Evaluator Hourly Billing Rates

Labor billing rates for all Evaluation Services performed under this SOW shall be per the rates indicated in Table 3. These rates shall remain firm for the duration of this SOW unless otherwise authorized in writing by AIU. All such costs shall be subject to the budget cap in section 9.4.

Table 3.0 Hourly Billing Rates

TITLE	NAME	FIRM	Prog Yr 1 Rate	Prog Yr 2 Rate	Prog Yr 3 Rate	Prog Yr 2/3 Avg
Vice President	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Principal	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Principal	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Principal	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Sr. Associate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Sr. Associate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Assoociate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Senior Analyst	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Consultant Associate	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Consultant Analyst	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Analyst	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Managing Consultant	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Principal Consultant	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Consultant Analyst	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Principal Consultant	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

Individuals other than employees of Evaluator (nonemployees) retained by Evaluator, such as subcontractors, outside Evaluators, or agency personnel, shall be billed at Evaluator's direct costs.

All reimbursable expenses shall be reasonable, ordinary, and necessary and shall be billed at cost. All such costs shall be subject to the budget cap in section 9.4.

9.6 Withholding

Payment by AIU to Evaluator for Evaluation Services performed on a time and materials basis will be monthly, in the undisputed amount due for Evaluation Services performed less percentage withholding, computed per the terms below, and satisfactorily completed during each month including reimbursable expenses, if any.

Ten percent (10%) will be withheld from each invoice, with the following conditions:

- The amount withheld during PY 1 is to be paid after delivery of Annual Report I;
- The amount withheld during PY 2 is to be paid after delivery of Annual Report

II; and

- 50% amount withheld during PY 3 is to be paid after delivery of Annual Report III and 50% is to be paid after delivery of the Final Report.

9.7 Notification

- Evaluator shall immediately notify AIU regarding any conditions or situations that may significantly affect performance of Evaluation Services by Evaluator.
- Evaluator shall report any conditions or situations to AIU including but not limited to: significant changes, additions or decreases, to the Evaluation Services requested, including out-of-scope Evaluation Services, which may significantly affect the price, schedule, quality, or other factors; delay in submittal of a deliverable to AIU; Evaluator non-compliance with any of the SOW terms; and, other circumstances which may warrant immediate notification to AIU.
- Following such notification, Evaluator shall respond to AIU requests for additional information within three (3) business days of such request, unless otherwise specified by AIU.

9.8 Contract Interface

In regard to matters relating to this SOW, Evaluator shall provide notice to AIU.

10.0 Documentation of Electronic Databases

At the conclusion of this SOW, all databases, including documentation, developed by Evaluator pursuant to this SOW, shall become the property of AIU. Evaluator shall deliver to AIU adequate data and documentation with the Final Report for AIU and, if desired, third parties to duplicate Evaluator's results.

Data base deliverables will consist of:

- A copy of the raw, unedited data as well as a copy of the final data base.
- A flow chart showing the process used to create the data base. This would include all inputs and outputs, even those of an intermediate nature.
- A copy of all routines, in both hard copy and electronic form, of all routines used in creating the data base. This would include all routines used to edit the data and especially all formulas used to create variables. All edits applied to any data base should be placed in a file. There will be no on-line, undocumented edits to the data.
- A description of all parameters required to run the various routines and examples of how the parameters are correctly used in the routine.
- The number of records expected in the file.
- A text description of the order that the routines should be run in to recreate the data base.
- A text description of any anomalies in the data that AIU should be aware of.
- A complete code book showing all names, length, type (character or numeric) and format (especially with SAS databases) of all variables as well as a short text description of each variable in the data base. Variables shall be named

using intuitively useful and consistent variable names.

- Where applicable, the data base will include some "key" variable that can be used to link the data to other corporate data bases. In the event that this in not possible due to confidentiality issues a cross reference file should be built and included which links a key variable to some fictitious customer identifying variable. NAME OR ADDRESS WILL NEVER BE USED AS THE KEY.
- All estimated data should be flagged. A complete description of how the estimated values were created will also be included. This will be done not just on the record level but for each variable. If a variable never has an estimated value, then no flag is needed.
- For interval data (load data), error codes from the collection system should be included with the data file. This can be a separate file, but will be in the same form as the interval data to facilitate matching error codes to the corresponding interval data.

For survey data bases, the following must be included:

- A sample survey will be included which clearly associates variable names with survey responses.
- Surveys should be designed with columns clearly associated with survey responses.

Form of the data base and data analysis:

- The data analysis will be conducted using the most current version of SAS (Statistical Analysis Software™), and all Programs and databases will be delivered in this format.

11.0 Execution

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Statement of Work to be executed by their authorized representatives, to be effective as of the Effective Date as reflected in the Agreement.

AMEREN SERVICES COMPANY	**SUPPLIER**
By: _____	By: _____
Authorized Signature	Authorized Signature
Stan E. Ogden	M. Sami Khawaja
V.P., Customer Services and Public Relations	Name
	Vice President
	Title
_____	1/5/09
Date	Date

and format (especially with SAS databases) of all variables as well as a short text description of each variable in the data base. Variables shall be named using intuitively useful and consistent variable names.

- Where applicable, the data base will include some "key" variable that can be used to link the data to other corporate data bases. In the event that this in not possible due to confidentiality issues a cross reference file should be built and included which links a key variable to some fictitious customer identifying variable. NAME OR ADDRESS WILL NEVER BE USED AS THE KEY.
- All estimated data should be flagged. A complete description of how the estimated values were created will also be included. This will be done not just on the record level but for each variable. If a variable never has an estimated value, then no flag is needed.
- For interval data (load data), error codes from the collection system should be included with the data file. This can be a separate file, but will be in the same form as the interval data to facilitate matching error codes to the corresponding interval data.

For survey data bases, the following must be included:

- A sample survey will be included which clearly associates variable names with survey responses.
- Surveys should be designed with columns clearly associated with survey responses.

Form of the data base and data analysis:

- The data analysis will be conducted using the most current version of SAS (Statistical Analysis Software™), and all Programs and databases will be delivered in this format.

11.0 Execution

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have caused this Statement of Work to be executed by their authorized representatives, to be effective as of the Effective Date as reflected in the Agreement.

AMEREN SERVICES COMPANY	**SUPPLIER**
By: Stan E. Ogden	By: _____
Authorized Signature	Authorized Signature
Stan E. Ogden	_____
	Name
V.P., Customer Service and Public Relations	_____
	Title
December 30, 2008	_____
Date	Date

ATTACHMENT A

Preliminary Illinois Evaluation Framework

This Attachment summarizes AIU's preliminary understanding of the evolving Illinois Evaluation Framework ("Framework") as of December 2008. The Framework has not yet been finalized, but AIU's expectation is that this Framework will be completed sometime in 2009 with the primary objective to guide the evaluation activities, from a high level, for the State of Illinois. The expectation is that this Attachment will be revised from time-to-time as the Framework continues to evolve.

Definitions to be applied to this section:

Types of Energy Efficiency and Demand Response Savings:

- **Naturally Occurring** – Energy efficiency savings that would have happened without utility sponsored programs (considers both incremental technological improvements that occur over time and institution improvements mandated by federal, state or local government);
- **Utility Program-Induced** – Energy efficiency savings that would not have occurred without utility sponsored programs.

Measure/Program kWh and kW Evaluated Savings Types:

- **Claimed Savings** – Savings calculated by Implementer based on stipulated values from Final Order, AIU DSM Implementation plan or Implementers past experience;
- **Verified Savings** – Sampled savings calculated by Evaluator through verification of actual installation of measures, or through review of Implementers tracking system.
- **Evaluated Savings** – Final savings calculated by Evaluator with all evaluation-based adjustments applied.

Approaches:

- **Retrospective** – results are used to determine measure/program savings for past program years;
- **Prospective** - results are used to adjust savings claims for future program years.

Draft Framework:

1. Application of evaluation results: retrospective vs. prospective approaches
   - Use a primarily prospective impact evaluation process whereby revised Claimed Savings values are applied on a going forward basis;
   - Focus impact evaluation on measurement of individual parameters and/or realization rates that can be applied prospectively;
   - Claimed Savings shall be adjusted based on a retrospective review of Verified Savings;

2. Application of Measured savings results:

- Apply net savings results in the same, primarily prospective manner as for gross savings parameters.
- Use the same approach for all applications of net savings results (e.g., assessing goal attainment, redesigning programs, cost-benefit analysis)
- Plan and implement net savings analyses in a manner that supports:
    a. Determination of utility program-induced savings.
    b. Decision-making regarding the allocation of resources across programs and measures.
    c. Provision of suggestions to improve program design and implementation.

3. Approaches for deeming Claimed savings:
    - Determine whether each measure shall be deemed (and therefore subject to prospective evaluation-based revisions) or non-deemed (and therefore subject to the prospective application of realization rates).
    - Determine for each deemed measure whether to deem unit savings, individual parameters, or calculation methods.
    - Base initial deemed values on:
        a. A review of the deemed values being used for each measure in a range of other states and service territories, with careful assessment of transferability based on factors such as program design, target populations, and climate.
        b. A review of relevant empirical studies, with a similar assessment of transferability as in (a).
    - Based later deemed values on Illinois-specific impact evaluation results.
    - Focus impact evaluation efforts on generating systematic improvements to the reliability of deemed values over time.

4. Sampling and measurement error:
    - Do not have specific quantitative standards regarding statistical precision;
    - Planning for impact evaluation should include systematic consideration of sources of both sampling and measurement error;
    - Across programs, limited impact evaluation resources should be allocated in a manner that minimizes overall uncertainty (including both sampling and measurement error) about total portfolio impacts;
    - Similarly, across impact evaluation activities within an individual program, resources should be allocated in a manner that minimizes overall uncertainty about total program impacts.
    - Efforts to minimize sampling and measurement error should be explicitly balanced;
    - Impact evaluation activities should be designed and staged to lead to a systematic, cumulative reduction in uncertainty over time.

5. Principles governing allocation of resources:
    - Focus evaluation resources on those areas that seem to have the greatest effects in making results uncertain
    - Balance efforts to measure gross savings parameters with efforts to measure net-to-gross ratios.
    - In estimating net-to-gross ratios, balance efforts to measure free ridership with efforts to measure spillover.

- Balance evaluation efforts focused on regulatory compliance with evaluation efforts focused on developing stronger measures, more effective programs, and new technologies and approaches.

6. Methods for estimating net savings:
   - In developing any framework rules regarding estimation of net savings, focus on establishing principles regarding which broad *classes* of methods (e.g., self-reporting, econometric, market-based) to use for which kinds of programs and situations;
   - Balance investment in the estimation of net-to-gross ratios with investment in the estimation of gross savings parameters;
   - Invest the most in estimation of net savings in cases where the NTGR is the most uncertain. In cases where the NTGR is likely to be uncertain and the savings are substantial, consider using multiple methods;
   - Exercise reasonableness, demonstrating understanding that extreme accuracy is typically neither feasible nor necessary;
   - When addressing uncertainty, prioritize efforts to limit measurement error that operates consistently in the same direction across programs;
   - Anticipate that NTGRs will evolve over time as the program matures;
   - Plan on multiple rounds of NTGR analysis, both to provide early feedback to be used in improving program design, and to capture changes in NTGRs;
   - To the extent self-reporting is used, develop standardized instruments at the statewide level to ensure consistency and comparability.

ATTACHMENT B

Preliminary Work Plan Outline

The Work Plan outline will be completed with the stakeholder group and the ICC as described in sections 1.0 and 7.0.

The Work Plans will include, but not be limited to, the following elements for each Program (with a summation for the REES Portfolio as a whole):

1. **Approach** –
   - The general evaluation approach for the program (general discussion of evaluation approach, including research objectives, rigor level, researchable questions, methodological framework, and high-level schedule)
   - Best-practice approaches appropriate to each Program, with the plans informed by standard technical references such as the International Performance Measurement and Verification Protocol and the National Action Plan Model Energy Efficiency Program Impact Evaluation Guide.
2. **Impact evaluation** –
   - Methodology for determining gross energy savings and gross demand reduction values
   - Methodology for determining deemed values
   - Description of how Program impact results will be combined to report REES Portfolio impacts, addressing the need for adjustments such as accounting for Program overlap or other factors.
3. **Free Riders/Drivers & Net-to-Gross** –
   - Methodology for determining NTG assessment
   - Scheduled data gathering for determining NTG
   - Description of how realization rates and NTGRs will be determined, including the possible use of stipulated versus researched NTGRs.
4. **Baseline** –
   - Determination of how the market baseline will be established, what approach will be used and when the market baseline will be completed
5. **Metrics** - To include the following components:
   - Determination of how the metrics, including energy and demand savings metrics, are to be collected
6. **Tracking System** -
   - Define when the Implementer's tracking system be reviewed
   - Determine when a report on the Implementer's tracking system for the program will be ready
   - Description of the data and information needed from Implementer with estimated dates that the data will be needed.
7. **Budget** -
   - The planned evaluation budget for each year
   - Demonstrate that the total across programs is within the 3% annual spending cap.
   - How the evaluation budget for this program fits as part of the total evaluation budget
   - Criteria used to allocate evaluation budget among program evaluations

- Description of the tradeoffs in allocating limited budget dollars to specific tasks and Programs, and why those tradeoffs were selected.

8. **Program Theory** –
   - The program theory for this program
   - When a program theory and logic model will be available
9. **QA/QC** –
   - How quality control and/or quality assurance is implemented
   - When a report program QA/QC will be available
10. **Process Evaluation** –
    - The approach to process evaluation
    - The elements of the process evaluation
    - The process evaluation completion date
11. **Reporting** –
    - How monthly or quarterly reporting of work in progress, goals and results, barriers encountered, changes in program and/or evaluation direction will be reported
12. **Year One Details** for each program (Note that the details could be in a separate section of the Evaluation Work Plan, or be collected in a separate document).
    - Specific tasks and sub-tasks
    - Detailed schedules
    - Detailed discussion of sampling, data collection, data cleaning, and analysis methods
    - Project and management milestones
    - Identification of staff resources
    - Detailed cost breakdowns
    - Dates of deliverables
13) **Future Planning** -- Strategy for conducting future (beyond 2011) market transformation analysis as Programs mature, and describing any data collection activities that will be carried out by Evaluator during the Term to support the future analysis.

ATTACHMENT C

0.1 Preliminary Evaluation Work Plan

This Attachment summarizes the Program-by-Program approaches that Evaluator has initially provided in its RFP Response. These will be modified/expanded into Work Plans in adherence to the schedule, format, and content outlined in the description of Task 1.

In general, the implementation of the evaluation and verification plan will consist of data collection or the transfer of data collected by AIU or its agents to Evaluator, followed by analysis of the data to estimate gross and net energy savings. The allocation of evaluation resources to each Program will be based on its associated impacts and uncertainty. All sample sizes indicated below are preliminary. At the kick-off meeting, Evaluator will help finalize the allocation of Program resources and sample sizes based on the results of Monte Carlo simulations to estimate potential uncertainty for each Program and each measure within a Program.

For each Program, as well as the REES Portfolio overall, Evaluator will conduct the cost-effectiveness analysis using standard tests including, but not necessarily limited to, the Utility Cost Test, Ratepayer Impact Test, and Total Resource Test. Evaluator will also incorporate the non-energy, economic, and environmental impacts of the Programs as appropriate. AIU staff will be provided access to all tools used by Evaluator at no additional cost for the duration of the evaluation.

Throughout the verification and evaluation efforts, Evaluator will maintain a database (EEIS or other) of all collected data. At the conclusion of the study (or at any point during the evaluation period), Evaluator will provide AIU with electronic files and an associated dictionary in any database format desired.

The individual plans presented in this Attachment propose methods for reviewing each Program's ex ante estimates through an examination of Program records supplemented with a simple engineering calculation, an energy simulation model, or a billing analysis. Throughout the process, Evaluator will attempt to establish stipulated savings values when appropriate. These decisions will be based on impacts and uncertainty of the measures being considered for stipulated savings (variations in savings for a particular measure in various applications).

Evaluator will also use the extensive list of measures in Evaluator's Demand-Side Management database in reviewing existing stipulated savings estimates and in developing prospective stipulated savings estimates. Evaluator's experience in California and elsewhere conducting similar reviews, as well as Evaluator's experience in populating the Demand-Side Management database, will inform Evaluator's review of the various AIU estimates of free riders, spillover, lifetimes, baseline, etc. This information will be supplemented with data collected from participant and non-participant surveys.

Metering entire homes or individual end uses is also a critical component of this study. The decision where to install metering equipment will be made—and the duration of metering efforts will be determined—after Program-specific potential impacts (primarily the kW component) are made available to Evaluator's team.

A preliminary work plan for each of the AIU REES Programs is provided on the following pages.

0.2 Data Collection Activities by Program

REES Program	Surveys (Households)	Site Visits (Homes)	Interviews (Individuals)	Metering (Equipment)
a. Home Energy Performance	140-175	30	20	0
b. Res HVAC T-U	140	60	20	60
c. Res Appliance Recycling	140	50	30	0
d. Res Light & App	140	50	20	50
e. Res Multifamily	140-175	30	20	0
f. Residential New HVAC	140	60	30	60
g. Res DR-DLC	140	30	15	
Total	**980-1,050**	**310**	**145**	**200**
Year 1	140	-	50	
Years 2 & 3	910	310	95	200

1.0 Home Energy Performance

Under the Home Energy Performance Program (HEP), incentives are provided for a electricity saving measures promoted in all electric single family homes. The implementation contractor will provide an energy audit and arrange for installation of measures as warranted by the audit. There may be coordination with other residential Program as warranted (e.g., HVAC Diagnostics and Tune-Up and Demand Response). Local firms will be trained to provide Program services.

1.1 Evaluation Approach

To verify the savings attributable to home energy performance (HEP), Evaluator will select random samples of participating homes on a recurring basis and review Program records associated with the selected homes, including rebate forms. During the first two quarters of Program implementation, Evaluator will examine all participant records. Subsequently, Evaluator will examine random samples (approximately 10 percent of participating homes) each quarter.

- A small sample of homes will be visited in the second and third year. The intent is to provide qualitative data inspecting respecting the quality of installations.

- Evaluator plans to conduct a billing analysis of both participating homes and a random sample of similar non-participant homes (with a representative distribution of home type, location, etc). Employing standard weather normalization tools to control for the effects of weather on energy consumption, Evaluator will weather-normalize each home individually, following an approach similar to that used by the Princeton Scorekeeping Method (PRISM), the industry standard for weather normalization. As a result it will be possible to determine each participating home's energy savings separately and to identify homes that have performed as expected, better than expected, or worse than expected. The characteristics of homes in these three groups will be investigated through reviews of program records, customer surveys, and site visits.
- Evaluator's billing analysis of all homes will begin 12 months after program inception to ensure adequate post-treatment data exist. Evaluator will re-run the billing analysis quarterly to ensure the program is tracking well with regard to projected energy savings and cost effectiveness.
- Program delivery will be assessed through interviews with program managers and random samples of contractors.
- Finally, participant assessment of HEP will be conducted by surveying customers chosen at random in Year 2 and Year 3 (total of up to 175 surveys). These surveys will also be used to assess free ridership, spill over, and installation rates.

1.2 Summary of HEP Evaluation Proposed Approach and Budget

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Data Collection	Stakeholders Interviews	10	5	5	20
	Participant Surveys	35	70	70	140-175
	Site Visits		15	15	30
	Review Records	Census	10% of Total	10% of Total	
Data Analysis	Billing Analysis		Census	Census	
Budget		$13,692	$27,324	$42,292	$83,308

1.3

HEP Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 22, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 22, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 23, 2009
Stakeholders Interview Script	February 23, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 23, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2:09
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4:09
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4:2010
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q3:2011
Final Report	Q1:2012

2.0 Residential HVAC Diagnostics and Tune-Up

2.1 Evaluation Approach

- The baseline for HVAC tune-up measures is the condition of the unit prior to maintenance or issue remediation (repair). The baseline for measures implemented by the program should be directly measured and data should be recorded by air conditioning contractors. Based on data from several regions (primarily California), some experts estimate that more than half the current stock of units are charged incorrectly or have insufficient airflow to balance their refrigerant capacity. Actual savings achieved by the program, however, will accrue from the actual state of the equipment (whether it is overcharged or undercharged) and how far out of specification its airflow is. Undercharging causes larger efficiency drop offs than overcharging; however, a significant portion of incorrectly charged systems may be overcharged.
- Baseline data collected should include refrigerant temperature, pressure, and supply-and return dry and wet bulb temperatures to assess whether a unit needs charging. The contractor should record first the amount of refrigerant added or removed and then record the new temperatures and pressures demonstrating that the unit is corrected to specification. Note that efficiency losses or gains depend in part on whether the unit has a fixed orifice or a thermostatic expansion valve. During verification visits, Evaluator will collect similar data assessing whether the unit is operating within specifications, based on superheat or subcooling calculations.
- During the site visits, Evaluator will measure refrigerant and airflow data to verify the tune-up, and Evaluator will collect other site details, including square footage, air conditioning size and model, and observed thermostat set points. While the cost of collecting these additional data will be very minor, the data will help program managers gain insights on sizing and usage practices. The site visit team will install logging power meters to monitor energy consumption of the tuned air conditioners at all sites visited. Although precisely measuring energy efficiency rating (EER) in the field is not practical without logging temperatures and humidity in real time, comparing power draw to unit size and local weather gives qualitative insights into whether a unit is operating properly. By examining time series of actual energy use and the results of probabilistic modeling, Evaluator can examine probable demand savings values. Consumption values (in kWh) will be based on measured improvements in charge and airflow values and on engineering calculations of savings. They will be compared to metered energy use. Final savings estimates will be compared to the ex ante values and, if differences between values are significant, our team will recommend changes in stipulated values for the program's future use.
- Evaluator's team will continuously measure HVAC energy consumption during the cooling season. Evaluator will make every attempt to collect pre- and post-demand data (in coordination with the implementation team). These data will be used to calibrate simulation model peak demand. The impacts estimated will follow IPMVP Option B retrofit isolation.
- To verify the savings, the Evaluator team will select random samples of participating homes and review their program records, including rebate forms.

- Evaluator also plans to conduct a billing analysis of participating homes and a random sample (by home type, location, etc.) of representative non-participating homes. Evaluator will use standard weather-normalization tools to control for the effects of weather on energy consumption. Using an approach similar to that employed by the Princeton Scorekeeping Method (PRISM)—considered the industry standard for weather normalization—each home will be weather normalized. With this method, it is possible to determine each participating home's energy savings separately and identify homes that have performed as expected, better than expected, or worse than expected. The characteristics of homes in these three groups will be investigated through reviews of program records, customer surveys, and site visits.
- Evaluator will begin their first billing analysis of all participating homes 12 months after program inception to ensure there are adequate baseline data. Evaluator will re-run the billing analysis quarterly to ensure the program is tracking well regarding projected energy savings and cost effectiveness.
- Program delivery will be assessed through interviews with program managers and random samples of contractors.
- Evaluator will use surveys to capture participants' perspectives on the program and to assess freeridership, spillover, and installation rates.

To effectively evaluate the HVAC/Tune-Up programs, the evaluation team would use direct measurements at the sites and engineering calculations. If the program contractors use varying methods (e.g., CheckMe! or Enalasys), Evaluator would consider evaluating the results by contractor method to see whether results vary by field system used. This table summarizes the proposed approach.

2.2

Summary of HVAC / Tune-Up Programs: Proposed Approach

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Data Collection	Stakeholders Interviews		10	10	20
	Participant Surveys		70	70	140
	Site Visits		30	30	60
	Metering		30	30	60
	Review Records		Census	Census	Census
Data Analysis	Billing Analysis		Census	Census	Census
Budget:		$ 1,132	$45,322	$69,683	$116,637

2.3

HVAC / Tune-Up Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 22, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 22, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 23, 2009
Stakeholders Interviews Sheet	February 23, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 23, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2 2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2010
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q3 2011
Final Report	Q1 2012

3.0 Residential Appliance Recycling Program

3.1 Evaluation Approach

- Participant interviews will help determine the NTGR (a metric especially critical and complex for appliance recycling programs) and assess marketing efforts and satisfaction levels. Significant discussion related to assessing free-ridership and spillover in appliance recycling programs has taken place in California recently. Evaluator will ensure the participant survey collects information necessary to follow the NTGR model developed in California. Survey respondents will also be asked about the program marketing efforts and the impacts of external factors on their participation decisions. Currently, Evaluator plan to interview 140 participants.
- For unit specific savings, Evaluator may rely on secondary sources. To evaluate the California programs over 1,000 units have been metered either in-situ or following DOE testing protocols. The results of these tests will be applied here in a manner that accounts for the observed distribution of recycled models, styles, sizes and age.

3.2 Summary of Residential Appliance Recycling Proposed Approach

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Data Collection	Stakeholders Interviews	10	10	10	30
	Participant Surveys	35	70	35	140
	Review Records		Census	Census	Census
Data Analysis	Engineering Analysis		Census	Census	Census
Budget		$11,112	$32,371	$50,103	$93,586

3.3

Residential Appliance Recycling Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 8, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 22, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 23, 2009
Stakeholders Interview Script	February 23, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 23, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2 2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2010
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q3 2011
Final Report	Q1 2012

4.0 Residential Lighting and Appliances

4.1 Evaluation Approach

- Evaluator will use a range of data-collection strategies to establish a model for compact fluorescent light (CFL) penetration and usage in AIU's service territory for each program year.
- Evaluator will conduct a survey of residential users in which Evaluator will assess the price responses, the quantity that would have been purchased at alternative prices and possibly different packaging configurations, and the extent of any participant spillover. In addition, all customers will be asked if they are an AIU customer, to determine what percentage of CFLs is leaving the service territory. Information collected for each household will include:
  - Number of CFLs in storage
  - Number of CFLs purchased in the past three months
  - Number of CFLs currently in sockets by location/application type
  - Number of CFLs installed (put into sockets) in the past three months
  - Number of sockets where CFLs could be used or are applicable by location/application type
  - Self-reported hours of operation
- Evaluator's initial plan provides for 20 interviews with program allies to better understand the program and inform the process evaluation.
- The CFL user survey will help estimate the distribution of time-to-installation for CFLs. It will also clarify the relationships between acquisition, installation, and storage rates, and develop a profile of household CFL usage patterns (as differentiated from hours of use). The telephone survey will also include questions that test for free-ridership and spillover in order to adjust gross savings appropriately.

- Nested site visits, participants solicited via the telephone survey, will be conducted to confirm data obtained through the CFL user telephone survey. Evaluator will use the site visits to confirm self-reported data on CFL storage, usage, installed location/application, wattage (installed and replacement), and remaining potential. During the site visits, Evaluator will install hours-of-use meters in four locations in each home. These meters will be left at the participating location for 1 month. Every attempt will be made to schedule the site visits and metering efforts in order to capture AIU system peak. Evaluator team currently proposes to conduct 50 site visits. Lighting loggers will be installed at each of these sites (up to 4 lights per site).
- Evaluation team will work with implementation contractor to collect participating retail sales data. This data will be analyzed to estimate the program induced "lift" in sales of energy efficiency products.
- Sales data from non-participating retailers will be estimated through telephone surveys and stocking studies.
- Attribution will also be assessed by comparing changes in sales from participating to nonparticipating stores, as well as examining sales in other states/regions that do not promote Energy Star lighting and appliances.
- Other progress indicators, such as awareness and availability, will be collected through telephone surveys and in-store stocking surveys (leveraging any stocking data collected by the program implementer).
- Evaluator team will aggregate and analyze all of the accumulated information to estimate gross and net savings.

4.2 Summary of Lighting and Appliances Proposed Approach

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Data Collection	Stakeholders Interviews	10	5	5	20
	Participant Surveys	35	70	35	140
	Site Visits/End Use Metering		25	25	50
	Review Records	Census	10% of Total	10% of Total	
Data Analysis	Simple Engineering	Census	Census	Census	Census
	Simple Engineering/End Use Metering		25	25	50
Budget		$14,632	$42,913	$66,420	$123,965

4.3

Lighting and Appliances Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 23, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 23, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 23, 2009
Stakeholders Interview Script	February 23, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 23, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2/2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4/2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4/2010
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q3/2011
Final Report	Q1/2012

5.0 Residential Multifamily

5.1 Evaluation Approach

- During the first two quarters of program implementation, Evaluator will review program documents, including records of marketing and outreach efforts. Evaluator will provide feedback on the program launch and initial activities to help ensure a successful and accurate start. Subsequently, during each quarter, Evaluator will examine samples of program documentation on approximately 10 percent of buildings enrolled in the program.
- As part of Evaluator verification efforts, site visits of samples of treated buildings and apartments will take place after the first year and will occur annually in the following two years. Evaluator estimates 15 buildings will be visited during each round. If 15 buildings have not participated in the first year, Evaluator will attempt to visit a census of the buildings that have completed the program. If measures were installed in both individual apartments and common areas, the actual number of units visited will exceed 15.
- To verify savings generated by program participation, Evaluator will conduct a billing analysis of participating buildings and units compared to a sample of representative non-participating buildings and multifamily units. Evaluator will use standard weather-normalization tools to control for the effects of weather on energy consumption. Using an approach similar to that employed by the Princeton Scorekeeping Method (PRISM, considered the industry standard for weather normalization) data from each treated multifamily unit will be weathernormalized. With this method, it is possible to determine each participating unit's energy savings separately and identify units that have performed as expected, better than expected, or worse than expected. The characteristics of units in these three groups will be investigated through reviews of program records, customer surveys, and site visits. This approach will work well for individually metered units. For master metered units, we will treat the whole complex as one unit, which, unfortunately, may limit the usefulness of the analysis.

- Similar to Evaluator's evaluation of the HEP program, Evaluator's first billing analysis will begin 12 months after program inception, provided a sufficient sample size. Evaluator will subsequently re-run the billing analysis quarterly and include new buildings as they complete the program. This iterative approach will help ensure the program is tracking well towards meeting its energy savings and cost effectiveness goals.
- Program delivery will be assessed through interviews with program managers, contractors, trade allies, and a random sample of participating building managers and contractors. Evaluator initially proposes that 10 interviews be conducted in the first year and five in each of the following years.
- A random sample of surveyed participants (building managers and/or owners) will inform an assessment of the program from the participant's perspective. The annual sample size will be participants in the second and third year, a total of up to 175 surveys. If there are less than 70 participants in either year, a survey of the census of participants will be attempted. These surveys will also be used to assess free-ridership, spillover, and program specific installation rates.

5.2 Summary of Multifamily Program Proposed Approach

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Data Collection	Stakeholders Interviews	10	5	5	20
	Participant Surveys	35	70	70	140-175
	Site Visits		15	15	30
	Review Records		10% of Total	10% of Total	
Data Analysis	Billing Analysis		Census	Census	Census
Budget		$14,212	$29,800	$46,124	$90,137

5.3

Multifamily Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 23, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 23, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 23, 2009
Stakeholders Interview Guide	February 23, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 23, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2 2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2010
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4 2011
Final Report	Q1 2012

6.0 Residential New HVAC

6.1 Evaluation Approach

- Data collected to demonstrate quality installation should include refrigerant temperatures and pressures and supply and return dry and wet bulb temperatures. If using a weigh-in method or adjusting the factory charge, the contractor should record the amount of refrigerant added or removed, then record the new temperatures and pressures demonstrating that the unit is corrected to specification. Note that efficiency losses or gains depend in part on whether the unit has a fixed orifice or a thermostatic expansion valve. During verification visits, Evaluator will collect similar data assessing whether the unit is operating within specifications based on superheat or sub-cooling calculations.
- Evaluator will conduct a total of 60 site visits, evenly distributed between the two program years. During the site visits Evaluator will measure refrigerant and airflow data to verify the installation. Evaluator also will collect other site details, including square footage, air conditioning size and model, and observed thermostat set points. The cost of collecting these additional data will be very minor, but they will help program managers gain insights on sizing and usage practices. The Evaluator site visit team will install logging power meters to monitor energy consumption of the new air conditioners at all sites visited. While precisely measuring Energy Efficiency Rating (EER) in the field is not practical without logging temperatures and humidity in real time, comparing power draw to unit size and local weather gives qualitative insights into whether a unit is operating properly. By examining time series of actual energy use and the results of probabilistic modeling, Evaluator can examine probable demand savings values. Consumption values (in kWh) will be based on measured improvements in charge and airflow values and on engineering calculations of savings. They will be compared to metered energy use. Final savings estimates will be compared to the ex ante values and, if differences between values are significant, our team will recommend changes in stipulated values for the program's future use.
- Evaluator team will continuously measure HVAC energy consumption during the cooling season. Evaluator will make every attempt to collect pre- and post-demand data (in coordination with the implementation team). These data will be used to calibrate simulation model peak demand. The impacts estimated will follow IPMVP Option B retrofit isolation.
- To verify the savings, the Evaluator team will review program records for all participants.
- Evaluator also plans to conduct a billing analysis of participating homes and a random sample (by home type, location, etc.) of representative non-participating homes. Evaluator will use standard weather-normalization tools to control for the effects of weather on energy consumption. Using an approach similar to that employed by the Princeton Scorekeeping Method (PRISM)—considered the industry standard for weather normalization—each home will be weather normalized. With this method, it is possible to determine each participating home's energy savings separately and identify homes that have performed as expected, better than expected, or worse than expected. The characteristics of homes in these three groups will be investigated through reviews of program records, customer surveys, and site visits.

- Evaluator will begin our first billing analysis of all participating homes 12 months after program inception to ensure there are adequate baseline data. Evaluator will re-run the billing analysis quarterly to ensure the program is tracking well regarding projected energy savings and cost effectiveness.
- Program delivery will be assessed through interviews with program managers and random samples of contractors.
- Evaluator will use surveys to capture participants' perspectives on the program and to assess free ridership, spillover, and installation rates.

6.2 Summary of Residential New HVAC Proposed Approach

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
	Stakeholders Interviews		15	15	30
	Participant Surveys		70	70	140
	Site Visits		30	30	60
Data Collection	Review Records	Census	Census	Census	Census
Data Analysis	Billing Analysis		Census	Census	Census
Budget		$8,532	$44,537	$68,933	122,001

6.3

New HVAC Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 31, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 31, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 28, 2009
Stakeholders Interview Script	February 28, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 28, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2/2009
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4/2011
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4/2011
Final Report	Q1/2012

7.0 Residential Demand Response-Direct Load Control (DLC)

7.1 Evaluation Approach

- To estimate the energy and peak demand impacts associated with the program, the Evaluator team will collect and analyze data on a range of variables that affect program savings. Evaluator will put the largest effort toward measuring accurately the variables that have the largest influence on total program savings.

- During annual site visits (Year 2 and Year 3) to a statistically significant sample of participating homes, the Evaluator team will gather key data such as air conditioner characteristics, building characteristics, and usage in response to cycling events or critical peak pricing. The site visits will also include a sample of end-use demand-metered data.
- Evaluator will conduct an annual participant survey in Year 2 and Year 3 to gather behavioral data related to thermostat usage, and household occupancy. Evaluator estimates initial sample sizes at 70 surveys. The surveys will also include process-related questions.
- Evaluator team will also conduct a non-participant telephone survey with 70 households in the second year. This survey will focus on understanding barriers to participation in the demand response programs and household demographics.
- Evaluator will implement surveys of participants who have dropped out of the programs to assess why customers decide to leave the program. This will enable us to make recommendations aimed at increasing program retention. While the number of program dropouts currently is unknown, Evaluator expects to contact a census of such households.
- All data Evaluators gather will be uploaded to a computerized energy simulation program (such as eQUest, a user-friendly derivative of the more data-intensive DOE-2). Using this tool, Evaluator's team will generate models to predict the participating homes' load characteristics under normal operation and when cycled during a load control event. The observed differences between these two conditions will be used to develop the electrical demand and usage reductions attributable to the program.
- Home energy use during various hours of the day, during normal operation, and during load controls will be analyzed using any metered data available through AIU. Regression models will be used to weather-normalize hourly use and produce estimates under any weather scenario desired. If non-participant hourly data are available, they can also be included in the modeling.
- Evaluator will accurately describe the program's processes, identify areas where it is operating optimally, and develop concrete and actionable recommendations for areas where improvements are needed. To do this, Evaluator will conduct in-depth interviews with a variety of program program allies early in the project to frame the process issues, understand the program's operations, and identify areas for improvement.
- Evaluator will also collect process-related information during the on-site data collection effort, particularly relating to the installation, maintenance, operation, and lifetime of the Smart thermostats.

7.2 Summary of Demand Response Programs Evaluation Proposed Approach

		Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Data Collection	Stakeholders Interviews	10	3	2	15
	Participant Surveys		35	35	70
	Site Visits		15	15	30
	Non participant Surveys		70		70

	Program Drop-out surveys		Census	Census	Census
	$22,396	$45,476	$70,387	$138,259	

7.3

Demand Response Preliminary Deliverable Schedule

Deliverable	Preliminary Date
Program Data Tracking Recommendation	January 22, 2009
Evaluation Plan	January 22, 2009
Survey Instruments	February 23, 2009
Stakeholders Interview Script	February 23, 2009
Site Visit Protocol and Instruments	February 23, 2009
Process and Verification Memorandum	Q2'09
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4'09
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q4'2010
Impact and Process Memorandum	Q3'2011
Final Report	Q1'2012

EXHIBIT B

Network Access

1. Data Transmission: In a format mutually acceptable to the Parties, Customer may electronically transmit any electronic record (hereinafter, "Data") to or receive Data from Ameren.

2. Third Party Service Providers

a. Data will be transmitted between each Party electronically, either directly or through a third party service provider (hereinafter, "Provider") under contract with either party. Any Provider used by either Party must be interconnected with the Provider of the other Party. Either Party may elect to change Providers, modify services, or discontinue service with their Provider upon thirty (30) days prior written notice to the other Party.

b. Each Party shall be responsible only for the costs incurred by its own Provider.

c. Each Party shall be solely liable for the acts or omissions of its own Provider while transmitting, receiving, storing or handling Data.

3. External Connections: Access to Ameren internal networks by Customer from remote locations must in all instances be approved in advance by Ameren. Such remote access may be revoked at any time for cause including unsatisfactory performance and non-compliance with Ameren security policies.

4. Systems Operation: Each Party, at its own expense, shall provide and maintain the equipment, software, services and testing necessary to effectively and reliably transmit and receive Data.

5. Security Procedures: Each Party shall properly use security that is sufficient to ensure that all transmission of Data is authorized and to protect its business records and Data from improper access. Customer's performance as to security matters will be under continuous evaluation by Ameren for the duration of this Agreement. Customer's access to the Ameren corporate network will be restricted to only that information required to complete contracted work, and Contractor must adhere to all Ameren security policies in force while connected to any Ameren network. Customer shall immediately report to Ameren any security breaches, including unauthorized access to or compromise of, Ameren information or resources.

EXHIBIT C

Ameren Vendor Billing Instructions

Ameren's methods for receiving invoices from its suppliers, in order of preference, are:

1. iSupplier Portal
2. Contractor Cost Tracking Module (CCTM)
3. E-mail with .pdf invoices
4. Paper invoices

Ameren prefers to make payments via the ACH (Automated Clearing House) payment system. Please complete the Direct Deposit Registration Form and email it to accountspayable@ameren.com or fax it to (314) 554-3443.

In order to receive timely payment, the following are the business rules you must follow with respect to each of these options.

iSupplier Portal

Ameren uses a web based supplier portal (iSupplier Portal) for purchase order delivery and invoice submission. iSupplier Portal allows Ameren's suppliers to electronically acknowledge and print purchase orders, "flip" the purchase order to an invoice and electronically submit the invoice to Ameren. The iSupplier Portal also allows you to view the status of any invoice submitted and processed by Ameren Accounts Payable. For questions on how to become a user of the iSupplier Portal please send an eMail to process_performance@ameren.com with 'iSupplier Portal Registration Inquiry' in the subject line.

In order to utilize this option, note the following requirements:

1. **Ameren Purchase Order Must Be Issued**
   Do not accept an order without a purchase order number. You can only send an electronic invoice for materials or services ordered with a purchase order. In addition, your electronic invoice must contain a nine digit Purchase Order number. You must submit a paper invoice to Ameren's Accounts Payable Department if a purchase order was not issued to you, which may delay payment.

2. **You Must Receive an Electronic Purchase Order to Invoice Electronically**
   If a Purchase Order is sent to you outside of iSupplier Portal (fax, email, or US mail), you cannot invoice the Purchase Order from iSupplier Portal. Paper copies of invoices should be sent to the Ameren Accounts Payable Department for processing (see instructions below).

3. **Prices Cannot Exceed Two Decimal Places**
   All line item, tax, freight, and miscellaneous charges can not be more than two decimal places.

4. **Quantities Cannot Exceed Two Decimal Places**
   Quantities invoiced for each Purchase Order line item can not be more than two decimal places.

5. **A Subcontractor Cannot Invoice Ameren Directly Against a Purchase Order Issued to You**
   If it is necessary for you to have another company fill an Ameren purchase order, the electronic invoice must still be submitted by your company; not the company who filled the order. The Supplier name on the invoice must match the supplier name on the Purchase Order.

6. **Standalone Charges Cannot be Invoiced Separately**
   Miscellaneous charges such as taxes and freight must be billed on the same invoice as the applicable materials or services.

7. **Description of Miscellaneous Charges Must Be Provided**
   Ameren's electronic invoicing process allows you to bill miscellaneous charges as necessary. A description of these charges must be included as part of the electronic invoice.

8. **Invoiced UOM Must Match Ameren's Purchase Order UOM**
   Your company is required to invoice in the same unit-of-measure in which Ameren orders materials or services. In addition, the unit-of-measure code must be identical (FOT for foot; not FT).

9. **Orders Paid by Credit Card**
   If you receive a purchase order for materials or services paid by credit card, acknowledge the purchase order, but do not send any other documents to Ameren (i.e., credit card acknowledgement, invoice, etc.).

10. **Other Invoice Submissions**
    An invoice should not be mailed, faxed or emailed for any invoice that has been or will be sent electronically.

Contractor Cost Tracking Module (CCTM)

CCTM is an application whereby suppliers maintain their Labor and Equipment rates on Rate Cards as well as submit their Labor and Equipment time via Time Cards.

Rate Cards are populated with agreed upon rates between the supplier and Ameren and once approved by Ameren comprise the basis rates for that supplier for all the service business delivered to Ameren. Rate Cards may be created manually or compiled into a worksheet by the supplier and uploaded into the system.

Time Cards are populated with Labor and Equipment actual utilization incurred by the supplier, again either manually or uploaded via worksheet into the system. Submittal of the Time Card constitutes the presentment of the second part of the two way match. The Purchase Order will

already be in place, the Time Card approval creates the match, and the AP system internally creates the voucher and the supplier is paid on terms via ACH without submitting an invoice. **CCTM suppliers should not send invoices directly to Ameren AP. Any CCTM purchase order invoices received directly by AP from CCTM suppliers will be rejected.** For further information on utilizing the CCTM, send an eMail to process_performance@ameren.com with 'CCTM Registration Inquiry' in the subject line.

E-mail with .pdf invoices

Generally, the same instructions (format and content) apply to handling of .pdf invoices sent by e-mail as apply to the handling of paper invoices (see below). To minimize the handling of paper, this alternative is preferable to paper invoices. Invoices submitted via email will be systematically processed and must adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Each invoice must be a unique .pdf file. Multiple .pdf files may be attached to a single email.
2. Only the .pdf file will be processed. Comments or instructions contained in the subject line or body of the email will not be reviewed.
3. Invoices must only be emailed once.
4. There are 3 different email addresses to be used based on the SUPPLIER'S name (excluding A, An, The).
    a. Suppliers whose name begins with A, B, E-H should submit their invoices to AccountsPayableTeam1@Ameren.com.
    b. Suppliers whose name begins with C, D, I-M should submit their invoices to AccountsPayableTeam2@Ameren.com.
    c. Suppliers whose name begins with N-Z should submit their invoices to AccountsPayableTeam3@Ameren.com

Paper invoices

The instructions below must be followed carefully in order to ensure proper and timely payment of your invoices:

1. **Each invoice must include the following information:**
    a. Appropriate and complete business name
    b. Remittance address
    c. Invoice number
    d. Invoice date
    e. Due date & payment terms
    f. Total or net amount due
    g. Description, price, & quantity of materials and/or services provided
    h. Itemize charges for:
        1. labor
        2. material
        3. taxes
        4. freight

i. Valid Purchase Order and release number and Purchase Order line item number(s).
j. Ameren contact name

2. **Instructions for prompt payment of invoices:**
   a. Orders from Ameren require a purchase order number. Orders placed for goods or services to be billed to an Ameren company will not be considered valid without a purchase order number. Invoices without a valid purchase order number will be returned and will result in delay of payment.
   b. Supplies or services must be delivered to the "Ship To" address before payment will be made.
   c. Invoice each purchase order separately. (**Note**: A purchase with a release number is a separate purchase order).
   d. Credits to be applied against a Purchase Order must be invoiced separately.

3. **Mail the <u>original</u> invoice to:**

   Ameren
   Accounts Payable (Code 230)
   P. O. Box 66892
   St. Louis, MO 63166-6892

   Unless you have prior approval from Ameren, invoices should be sent directly to the above address and <u>NOT</u> to the individual departments. Payments for invoices not directly sent to this address <u>will</u> be delayed. Do not mail hard copies of the invoice if being submitted in any of the other formats (iSupplier, CCTM, or .pdf).

4. **Other:**

   a. Send an invoice, not a statement. NO STATEMENT WILL BE PROCESSED FOR PAYMENT.
   b. Do not use a marker to highlight items on an invoice. This causes the highlighted area to be illegible when viewed through Ameren's imaging system.
   c. Ameren must have your employer identification number (EIN) or a social security number (SSN) on file in order to make payment. If Ameren does not have this information on file, an Ameren Supplier Set-Up Form, or IRS Form W-9 must be completed prior to processing an invoice for payment.
   d. For faster processing, please submit all invoices on 8½" white paper.

For general Accounts Payable questions you may contact Ameren's Accounts Payable department by email at <u>accountspayable@ameren.com</u> or by calling 314.554.4INV.

For specific purchase order questions contact your Ameren buyer or Ameren field contact.

Your cooperation in meeting these requirements will be greatly appreciated. **Failure to comply with the above instructions <u>will</u> result in delay of payment.**